



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/726,046 | 12/02/2003 | Kailash K. Mutha | LUC-430/Mutha 1 | 2678 |
| 32205 7590 08/23/2010 Carmen Patti Law Group, LLC ONE N. LASALLE STREET 44TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60602 | | | | |
| EXAMINER | | | | |
| DAFTUAR, SAKET K | | | | |
| ART UNIT | | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| 2451 | | | | |
| MAIL DATE | | DELIVERY MODE | | |
| 08/23/2010 | | PAPER | | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/726,046

Applicant(s)

MUTHA, KAILASH K.

Examiner

SAKET K. DAFTUAR

Art Unit

2451

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/CD)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

Response to Amendment

1. This office action is responsive to the amendment filed on June 29th, 2010. Claims 1-30 are presented for the further examination.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see remarks, filed June 29th, 2010, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-2, 5-11, 14-15, and 19-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Sridhar et al U.S. Patent Number 6,324,582 B1 (hereinafter Sridhar) and Thompson et al U.S. Publication Number 2002/0075304 A1 (hereinafter Thompson), and further in view of Jenny et al. US Publication Number 2003/0065743 A1 (hereinafter Jenny).
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5. Claim 21 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 21 is still (even after November 1st, 2007 submission) directed towards transitory propagating signals, *per se based on broadest reasonable interpretation to the claim language "computer readable medium"*. The United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) is obliged to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation consistent with the specification during proceedings before the USPTO. See *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319 (Fed. Cir. 1989) (during patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow). The broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim drawn to a computer readable medium (also called machine readable medium and other such variations) typically covers forms of non-transitory tangible media and transitory propagating signals per se in view of the ordinary and customary meaning of computer readable media, particularly when the specification is silent. See MPEP 2111.01. When the broadest reasonable interpretation of a claim covers a signal per se, the claim must be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as covering non-statutory subject matter. See *In re Nuijten*, 500 F.3d 1346, 1356-57 (Fed. Cir. 2007) (transitory embodiments are not directed to statutory subject matter) and *Interim Examination Instructions for Evaluating Subject Matter Eligibility Under 35 U.S.C. § 101*, Aug. 24, 2009; p. 2.

A claim drawn to such a computer readable medium that covers both transitory and non-transitory embodiments may be amended to narrow the claim, examiner suggests, to cover only statutory embodiments to avoid a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101 by adding the limitation "non-transitory" to the

claim. *Cf Animals - Patentability*, 1077 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 24 (April 21, 1987) (suggesting that applicants add the limitation “non-human” to a claim covering a multi-cellular organism to avoid a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 101). Such an amendment would typically not raise the issue of new matter, even when the specification is silent because the broadest reasonable interpretation relies on the ordinary and customary meaning that includes signals *per se*. The limited situations in which such an amendment could raise issues of new matter occur, for example, when the specification does not support a non-transitory embodiment because a signal *per se* is the only viable embodiment such that the amended claim is impermissibly broadened beyond the supporting disclosure. *See, e.g., Gentry Gallery, Inc. v. Berkline Corp.*, 134F.3d 1473 (Fed. Cir. 1998).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15, 19-25 and 29-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar et al U.S. Patent Number 6,324,582 B1 (hereinafter Sridhar) and Thompson et al U.S. Publication Number 2002/0075304 A1 (hereinafter Thompson), and further in view of Jenny et al. US Publication Number 2003/0065743 A1 (hereinafter Jenny).

As per claim 1, Sridhar discloses one or more server [see figure 6, blocks 616, 630, 640] components operable to communicate with one or more router component wherein the one or more server components are operable to employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices [router 614, 622] to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29), wherein the one or more router components register one or more assigned internet protocol addresses with the one or more server components ,(Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, see Figures 6, 9-11 and column 19, lines 1-51 see figure 1, router is located in network) and wherein the one or more server components assign an internet protocol (IP) address to the one or more communication devices (see figure 14, column 25, line 39- column 26, line 50).

Sridhar teaches that each network is associated with Router (see figure 1, router is located in network) in order for packet to be transported to and from the assigned network.

However, Sridhar is silent about the user identifier being a phone number, an email address, an Instant message name and user name and the router being located in the one or more homes or offices network and wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium.

Thompson teaches that the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number [respective unique dial numbers in the switched telephone network] for one or more users [team] associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083 PSTN destination number, IP address, e-mail address for each communication device identified by the respective team member in their current personal profile); an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083 PSTN destination number, IP address, e-mail address for each communication device identified by the respective team member in their current personal profile) ; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083, 0086, and 0107-0108 team member communicating with other person or team members through instant messaging, email, voice and multi-media communications and the telephone number of the team member's home telephone hand-set and the IP and e-mail addresses of the team member's home PC are included in the communications preferences information to enable establishment of text and voice communications sessions); and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083, 0086, and 0107-0108 team member communicating with other person or team members through instant messaging, email, voice and multi-media communications and the telephone number of the team member's home telephone hand-set and the IP

and e-mail addresses of the team member's home PC are included in the communications preferences information to enable establishment of text and voice communications sessions) located in a home or office network.; wherein the one or more server components employ the one or more identifiers and one or more screening preferences to direct one or ore messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices, and wherein at least one of the screening preferences is an alert preferences (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083, 0086, 0107-0108 and 0197 alerting the team member the team members using VTE clients (A) and (B) that (C) [examiner considers team members id has been used to screen communication between one or more clients and the same user id has been used to alert other team members indicating that one or more team members has joined the conference] has joined the voice communications session); and a voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) call [examiner considers Thompson is directed to a method and system for supporting communications within a virtual team environment and clearly discloses a online or web conference system such as "NetMeeting" and discloses or suggest such "collaboration between two or more people using text chat, streaming video, and/or voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) conversation" (see paragraph 0010)].

Jenny teaches wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium (see

paragraphs 0030-0033, server may further comprises additional mass storage facilities such as optical drive.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Jenny and Thompson, as they all are from same field endeavor, to establish a communicating between a client communication system and multiple server communication systems over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems, including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network.

As per claim 2, Sridhar discloses the one or more server components employ the one or more identifiers to search one or more databases to make the determination of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14)

As per claim 5, Sridhar discloses upon the determination by the one or more server components of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, one or more of the one or more server components communicate one or more messages or calls through the internet to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claim 6 and 20, Sridhar discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar is silent about one or more of the one or more messages or calls comprise one or more video messages.

Thompson teaches the apparatus of claim 5, wherein one or more of the one or more messages or calls comprise one or more video messages wherein the one or more of the one or more server components communicate the one or more video messages through the internet to one or more of the one or more internet protocol address of one or more of the one or more router components (see paragraph 0010, 0037, 0078)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Jenny and Thompson, as they all are from same field endeavor, to establish a communicating between a client communication system and multiple server

communication systems over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems, including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network.

As per claim 7, Sridhar discloses one or more second server components that employ the one or more identifiers of the one or more communication devices to direct the one or more messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claim 8, Sridhar discloses one or more of the one or more second server components employ one or more screening preferences of one or more of the one or more users associated with one or more of the one or more communication devices to direct one or more of the one or more messages or calls to the one or more of the one or more communication devices (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claim 9, Sridhar discloses the one or more screening preferences are stored in one or more databases (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29), wherein the one or more of the one or more second server components employ the one or more of the one or more messages or calls to perform a search of the one or more screening preferences

[database directory, column 17, lines 40-58], wherein the one or more of the one or more second server components employ one or more results of the search to direct the one or more of the one or more messages to the one or more of the one or more communication devices (Abstract, column 5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claims 10 and 11, Sridhar discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices ; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar is silent about one or more of the one or more router components are coupled with a landline telephone network and one or more of the one or more router components are coupled with a mobile network.

Thompson teaches one or more of the one or more router components are coupled with a landline [wired telephone] telephone network and one or more of

the one or more router components are coupled with a mobile [wireless communication network] network (see paragraph 0078 and figure 1).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Jenny and Thompson, as they all are from same field endeavor, to establish a communicating between a client communication system and multiple server communication systems over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems, including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network.

As per claim 14, Sridhar discloses wherein the one or more first server components employ the one or more identifiers to search one or more databases to make the determination of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14)); wherein upon the determination by the one or more first server components of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, one or more of the one or more first server components communicate one or more messages or calls through the internet to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with

Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14); the apparatus further comprising: one or more second server components (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20);wherein upon receipt of the one or more messages or calls at the one or more router components, the one or more second server components employ the one or more identifiers of the one or more communication devices to direct the one or more [command messages such as abort message goes through gateway device to remote server] messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14, column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 7).

As per claim 15, Sridhar discloses searching one or more databases (column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29), with one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14); and sending one or more messages (column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 7 and Figure 6; sending command messages such as abort message via gateway communicating device), or calls to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components for direction to the one or more communication devices, wherein the one or more router components register one

or more assigned internet protocol addresses with the one or more server components,(Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, see Figures 6, 9-11 and column 19, lines 1-51 see figure 1, router is located in network).

Sridhar teaches that each network is associated with Router (see figure 1, router is located in network) in order for packet to be transported to and from the assigned network.

However, Sridhar is silent about the user identifier being a phone number, an email address, an Instant message name and user name and the router being located in the one or more homes or offices network and wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium.

Thompson teaches that the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number [respective unique dial numbers in the switched telephone network] for one or more users [team] associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083 PSTN destination number, IP address, e-mail address for each communication device identified by the respective team member in their current personal profile); an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083 PSTN destination number, IP address, e-mail address for each communication device identified by the respective team member in their current personal profile) ; an instant message name for the one

or more users associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083, 0086, and 0107-0108 team member communicating with other person or team members through instant messaging, email, voice and multi-media communications and the telephone number of the team member's home telephone hand-set and the IP and e-mail addresses of the team member's home PC are included in the communications preferences information to enable establishment of text and voice communications sessions); and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083, 0086, and 0107-0108 team member communicating with other person or team members through instant messaging, email, voice and multi-media communications and the telephone number of the team member's home telephone hand-set and the IP and e-mail addresses of the team member's home PC are included in the communications preferences information to enable establishment of text and voice communications sessions) located in a home or office network.; wherein the one or more server components employ the one or more identifiers and one or more screening preferences to direct one or ore messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices, and wherein at least one of the screening preferences is an alert preferences (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083, 0086, 0107-0108 and 0197 alerting the team member the team members using VTE clients (A) and (B) that (C) [examiner considers team members id has been used to screen communication between

one or more clients and the same user id has been used to alert other team members indicating that one or more team members has joined the conference] has joined the voice communications session); and a voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) call [examiner considers Thompson is directed to a method and system for supporting communications within a virtual team environment and clearly discloses a online or web conference system such as "NetMeeting" and discloses or suggest such "collaboration between two or more people using text chat, streaming video, and/or voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) conversation" (see paragraph 0010)].

Jenny teaches wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises one of an optical, a biological, or an atomic data storage medium (see paragraphs 0030-0033, server may further comprises additional mass storage facilities such as optical drive.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Jenny and Thompson, as they all are from same field endeavor, to establish a communicating between a client communication system and multiple server communication systems over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems, including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network.

As per claim 19, Sridhar discloses the method of claim 15, wherein the one or more databases comprise one or more first databases, wherein the step of sending the one or more messages or calls to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components for direction to the one or more communication devices comprises the steps of: searching one or more second databases to direct one or more of the one or more messages or calls to one or more of the one or more communication devices (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 7; column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14); directing the one or more of the one or more communication messages to the one or more of the one or more communication devices through employment of one or more of the one or more identifiers and one or more message screening preferences [database directory, column 17, lines 40-58], of one or more users of the one or more communication devices (Abstract, column5, line 5 – column 6, line 20, column 14, line 49 – column 15, line 7; column 8, line 18 – column 9, line 29, column 25, lines 13-28, lines 52-67 with Figure 16 and column 27, line 24 – column 28, line 14).

As per claim 21, claim 21 is an article claim of method claim 15. Claim 21 does not teach or further define over the limitation as recited in claim15. Therefore, claim 21 rejected under same scopes as discussed in claim 15, supra.

As per claim 22, Sridhar discloses one or more communication devices comprise one or more of a computer (see Figure 14).

As per claim 23, Thompson discloses one or more router components located in the one or more homes or offices are operable to receive a call or message from a network component through a fixed wireless interface (see Figures.1-4 and paragraph 0078).

As per claims 23-25, Thompson teaches that a network could be a home network or office network (see Figure 1, block 4a, 10a and 4b, 10b), and wherein the one or more server components employ the one or more identifiers and one or more screening preferences to direct one or ore messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices, and wherein at least one of the screening preferences is an alert preferences (see paragraph 0011, 0031, 0083, 0086, 0107-0108 and 0197 alerting the team member the team members using VTE clients (A) and (B) that (C) [examiner considers team members id has been used to screen communication between one or more clients and the same user id has been used to alert other team members indicating that one or more team members has joined the conference] has joined the voice communications session).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Jenny and Thompson, as they all are from same field endeavor, to establish a communicating between a client communication system and multiple server communication systems over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems,

including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network.

As per claims 29-30, they do not teach or further define the claims as recited in claim 1 (amended). Therefore, claims 29-30 are rejected under same rationale as discussed in claim1.

8. Claims 26-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Jenny, and Thompson and further in view of Levine et al. US Publication Number 2004/0258220 A1 (hereinafter Levine).

As per claims 26-28, Sridhar, Jenny and Thompson discloses one or more server components operable to communicate with one or more router component wherein the one or more server components are operable to employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more router components register one or more assigned internet protocol addresses with the one or more server components, and wherein the one or more server components assign an internet protocol (IP) address to the one or more communication devices.

Thompson teaches that the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices ; an instant message name for the

one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices ; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices located in a home or office network.; wherein the one or more server components employ the one or more identifiers and one or more screening preferences to direct one or ore messages or calls through the one or more router components to the one or more communication devices, and wherein at least one of the screening preferences is an alert preferences; and a voice over Internet Protocol (VOIP) call.

Jenny teaches wherein at least one of the one or more server components comprises one of an optica data storage medium

However, Sridhar, Jenny and Thompson are silent about screening preferences being a forwarding preference which directs one or more messages or calls to another communicating device such as voice mailbox, answering machine, another muter component or another communicating devices.

As per claim 26, Levine teaches one of the screening preferences is a forwarding preference which directs the one or more messages or calls to another communication device (see abstract, see figure 3, paragraphs 0002-0010, 0020-0022, 0039-0042).

As per claim 27, Levine teaches one of the screening preferences is a forwarding preference which directs the one or more messages or calls to another muter component in another location (see abstract, see figure 3, paragraphs 0002-0010, 0020-0022, 0039-0042).

As per claim 28, Levine teaches one of the screening preferences is a preference for a voice mailbox or an answering machine(see abstract, see figure 3, paragraphs 0002-0010, 0020-0022, 0039-0042) .

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Jenny, Levine and Thompson, as they all are from same field endeavor, to establish a communicating between a client communication system and multiple server communication systems over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems, including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network and redirects or forward message to their respective voice mail box or answering system.

9. Claims 3-4 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Jenny, and Thompson (hereinafter Sridhar1) as applied to claims 1-2, 5-11, 14-15, and 19-21 above, and further in view of Conrath U.S. Patent Number 7,103,770 B2 (hereinafter Conrath).

As per claims 3 and 4, Sridhar1 discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more

communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices, and wherein the one or more server components assign an internet protocol (IP) address to the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar1 is silent about the Internet protocol not being static and dynamic address.

As per claim 3, Conrath teaches wherein one or more of the one or more server components search one or more of the one or more databases to make a determination of the one or more dynamic internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6).

As per claim 4, Conrath teaches wherein one or more of the one or more server components search one or more of the one or more databases to make a determination of the one or more static internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Jenny, Conrath and Thompson, as they all are from same field endeavor, to establish a communicating between a client communication system and multiple server communication systems over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems,

including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network.

As per claims 16 and 17, Sridhar1 discloses searching one or more databases, with one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components; and sending one or more messages, or calls to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components for direction to the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar1 is silent about the Internet protocol not being static and dynamic address.

As per claim 16, Conrath teaches determination of the one or more dynamic internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6); and sending one or more of the one or more messages or calls through the internet to the one or more dynamic internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6 and column 9, lines 4-13 for messaging using Internet address and TCP ports that support static and dynamic IP addresses).

As per claim 17, Conrath teaches determination of the one or more static internet protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6); and sending one or more of the one or more messages or calls through the internet to the one or more static internet

protocol addresses of the one or more of the one or more router components (column 1, line 60 – 2, line 6 and column 9, lines 4-13 for messaging using Internet address and TCP ports that support static and dynamic IP addresses).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Jenny, Conrath and Thompson, as they all are from same field endeavor, to establish a communicating between a client communication system and multiple server communication systems over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems, including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network.

As per claim 22, Thompson discloses one or more communication devices comprise one or more of a computer, telephone, mobile phone (see Figures.2-4).

10. Claims 12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, Jenny, and Conrath (hereinafter Sridhar2) as applied to claims 1- 11, 14-17, and 19-21 above, and further in view of Brooks et al U.S. Patent Number 7, 047,305 B1 (hereinafter Brooks).

As per claims 12 and 18, Sridhar2 discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise

any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and a user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices. and wherein the one or more server components assign an internet protocol (IP) address to the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar2 is silent about one or more of the one or more communication devices comprise one or more smart appliances with one or more functions and one or more functions of the one or more smart appliances through direction of one or more of the one or more messages or calls through one or more of the one or more router components.

As per claims 12 and 18, Brooks teaches the one or more of the one or more communication devices comprise one or more smart appliances with one or more function, wherein one or more of the one or more second server components direct one or more of the one or more messages [video streaming] or calls through one or more of the one or more router components to trigger one or more of the one or more functions of the one or more smart appliances and the step of sending the one or more messages or calls to the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components (see column 1, lines 20-36).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Jenny, Conrath, Thompson and Brooks, as they all are from same field endeavor, to establish a communicating between a client communication with multiple server, whereas client communication devices includes communication devices such as smart appliances and communicating, over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems, including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network.

11. Claim 13 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sridhar, Thompson, , Conrath, Jenny, and Brooks (hereinafter Sridhar3) as applied to claims 1-12 and 14-21 above, and further in view of Maes et al U.S. Patent Number 6,801,604 B2 (hereinafter Maes).

As per claim 13, Sridhar3 discloses one or more server components that employ one or more identifiers of one or more communication devices to make a determination of one or more internet protocol addresses of one or more router components, wherein the one or more identifiers comprise any one or more of: a phone number for one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an email address for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; an instant message name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; a

user name for the one or more users associated with the one or more communication devices; and wherein the one or more server components assign an internet protocol (IP) address to the one or more communication devices.

However, Sridhar3 is silent about one or more mobile communication devices and wherein upon the determination by the one or more server components of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, the one or more mobile communication devices employ an H.323 protocol to communicate one or more messages or calls through the internet to one or more of the one or more internet protocol address of one or more of the one or more router components.

As per claim 13, Maes teaches one or more mobile communication devices (see column 1, lines 35-56, column 3, lines 50-65;) and wherein upon the determination by the one or more server components of the one or more internet protocol addresses of the one or more router components, the one or more mobile communication devices employ an H.323 protocol (see column 10, lines 20-25; column 40, lines 4-33) to communicate one or more messages or calls through the internet to one or more of the one or more internet protocol address of one or more of the one or more router components.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teachings of Sridhar, Thompson, Conrath, Jenny, and Brooks and Maes, as they all are from same field endeavor, to provide a improved scalable system for point to point data

streaming, to establish a communicating between a client communication with multiple server, whereas client communication devices includes communication devices such as smart appliances and mobile devices, over a data communication network whereas the client accept a request to communicate with one of the server communication systems, including accepting a request to communicate with a server computer at a network address over the data communication network.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See accompanying PTO 892 form.

- a. Method and System for Distributing Requests for Content by Jenny et al . US Publication Number 2003/0065743 A1.
- b. Selective Routing by Raciborski et al, U.S. Patent Number 6,658,000 B1.
- c. Architecture for client- server communication by Verkler et al. U.S. Patent Number 6,157,941 A.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Contact Information

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saket K. Daftuar whose telephone number is 571-272-8363. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5:00pm M-W.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on 571-272-3964. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

Art Unit: 2451

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/S. K. D./

Examiner, Art Unit 2451

/John Follansbee/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2451